

plane, cooled and solidified in a compression-deformed state so as to have orientation of crystal planes in a direction parallel to the compression plane.

As to subparagraph (b), it is to be noted the preamble of claim 1 has been amended to correct this alleged informality. For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 USC § 112 is requested.

Claims 1, 3, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by the newly cited patent to Lemstra. In making this rejection, it was asserted that the Lemstra patent teaches in the noted portion a oriented crystallized UHMWPE molded article which is partially crosslinked and has melting point as set forth in claims 3 and 11. Reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above claim amendments and the following comments is requested.

From a careful review of the cited Lemstra patent, it is submitted that the portions of the patent cited by the examiner do not teach, among other things, a compression plane for the article. More specifically, the articles according to the Lemstra patent are either drawn or stretched rather than being compressed and thus would not have a compression plane. As such, the articles as taught by the Lemstra patent thus would not have an orientation of crystal planes in a direction parallel to the compression plane as presently claimed.

It is further submitted that this distinction between the crystal structure of the articles of the present invention and the articles according to the Lemstra patent is significant

to the ultimate properties of the respective articles. In this respect, the Lemstra patent discloses mechanical and chemical properties of filaments such as a tensile strength, modulus, xylene insoluble content in addition to thermal properties in lines of 31 to 61, of col 4 thereof. However, the Lemstra patent fails to disclose a wear property with the characteristics of the present invention. In distinct contrast, the molded articles according to the present invention have good wear resistance as shown in Table 1 and as discussed in the subject specification from line 26 of page 11 to line 1 of page 12 whereas the Lemstra patent has no description as to wear resistance.

In addition, the Lemstra patent also discloses in lines of 13 to 20 of col. 21 thereof the thermal properties of polyethylene which are "demonstrative of a significant change of chemical composition." However, the patent fails to disclose to disclose that the polyethylene is "crosslinked slightly" as is also presently claimed. In terms of making significant changes to a chemical composition such as polyethylene, there are many possible modifications including decomposition, grafting and branching as well as crosslinking from deep to slight state. Therefore, the statement that a "significant change of chemical composition" occurs according to the Lemstra patent is not a direct teaching nor a suggestion of "slightly crosslinked" as presently claimed.

For the reasons stated above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and allowance of claims 1, 3 and 10-11 as amended over the cited Lemstra patent are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject application is now in condition for allowance and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

In the event this paper is not timely filed, the undersigned hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-2340, along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN, HATTORI,
McLELAND & NAUGHTON

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Donald W. Hanson", written over a horizontal line.

Donald W. Hanson
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,133

Atty. Case No. 960381

1725 K Street, N.W., Suite 1000
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930
DWH:rab